



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BC8

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/949,525 10/14/97 WIENER

M ENT970827-1

EXAMINER

WM31/1022

CHRISTOPHER J RECKAMP
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ
222 NORTH LASALLE STREET
SUITE 2600
CHICAGO IL 60601

MEISLAHN, D ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-------------------------	--------------

2132
DATE MAILED:

26

10/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/949,525

Applicant(s)
Michael J. Wiener And Josanne M. Otway

Examiner
Douglas Meislahn

Group Art Unit
2132

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Douglas Meislahn (3) _____

(2) Christopher Reckamp (4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 9, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Independents, specifically 1

Identification of prior art discussed:
Ellison and Lewis

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner explained his interpretation of the claims. Specifically, "by a multi-client manager" does not preclude a user from choosing the expiry data. Applicant explained differences between the intended invention and this interpretation. The examiner doubts that the inclusion of these features would result in an allowance. The examiner feels that Ellison is enabled, particularly in the context of Lewis.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Gail Hayes
GAIL HAYES

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.